



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,679	05/31/2001	Martin John Millmore	5231-051-US01	7209
68009	7590	03/02/2009	EXAMINER	
Hanify & King, P.C. 1875 K Street Suite 707 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			AMINI, JAVID A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<i>Office Action Summary</i>	Application No. 09/867,679	Applicant(s) MILLMORE ET AL.	
	Examiner JAVID A. AMINI	Art Unit 2628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/4/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's arguments that the combination of Wolff and Batres does not teach the recited claimed features in claims 1 and 3.

In order to understand the claimed invention, Examiner provides an application of the claimed invention in light of specification, on page 3 lines 30-34 discloses "One of the data entry fields is "Address Style" as indicated at 20 and in this field, the user enters the country of residence of the person concerned. In this example, the country may be "United Kingdom" or "United States"". E.g., if the country entered is "United Kingdom" the processor will obtain from storage a definition of further data entry fields corresponding to a United Kingdom address and these will then be displayed as part of the form. Another word the address style of United Kingdom is different from address style of USA. If the address style of USA starts with a "number" the address style of United Kingdom starts with a "city name" as an example. Examiner's notes: the method and system will react to proper forms by entering USA/United Kingdom. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize the similarities of prior arts teachings with the claimed features. Because Wolff teaches e.g., forms 1-7 see fig. 2 #60. Those forms can be named differently, on top of that each form has corresponding attribute, see fig. 1 #58, e.g., form 1 contains attributes of 58c-58i. The attributes of form1 are different from form 2, see fig. 6. All forms 1-7 are stored in databases 1-3, see figs. 1-2. Obviously Wolff displays the set of data entry fields that corresponds to e.g., form 2 that selected by a user. A person skill in the art may equate corresponding attribute data 379 to what

Art Unit: 2628

recited in claimed invention. Similarly Batres illustrates in figs. 3 and 10 two different forms #100 and #150. A person skill in the art may equate corresponding attribute data e.g., #102, 104, 106 and so on in form 100. The step 508 in fig. 5 can be considered as monitoring data values. Batres teaches a database #80, see fig. 2.

Examiner believes that Applicant's arguments do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited made.

The previous rejections are still maintained for the reasons above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff. et al (5,774,887) (hereinafter Wolff) in view Batres (6,832,351 B1).

Claim 1.

Wolff teaches a computer-implemented system for controlling the appearance of a data entry form on a display to which the system is connected for use in entering data into a database (i.e. noted in fig. 1 databases, an interface #38, a video display #34), the system comprising a storage for storing attribute data defining attributes of a data entry form having at least one data

Art Unit: 2628

entry field (i.e. noted in fig. 2 that Wolff teaches four types of objects, and each contains an attribute, e.g., a form, a task, an address, and etc., and they are all have at least one data entry, e.g., street entry, customer's name, see col. 4 lines 49-67) and, for the at least one data entry field, storing a plurality of data values and, for each of the plurality of data values (e.g., in fig. 2 the object 60 storing a plurality of e.g., forms 1-7, and each of these form 1-7 stores corresponding attribute data defining a different set of data entry fields for each of the plurality of data values and a controller for causing the data entry form to be displayed on a display in accordance with the stored attribute data (e.g., see in figs. 6-7),

Wolff is silenced to specify explicitly for monitoring data values entered into said at least one data entry field, and, in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values, displaying the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the set of data entry fields.

However, Batres teaches for monitoring data values entered into said at least one data entry field, and, in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values (e.g., see client data control in col. 8 lines 14-19), displaying the set of data entry fields that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the set of data entry fields, see col. 6 lines 56-67, and col. 7 lines 1-8.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to combine teachings of Batres into the teachings of Wolff, because both of prior arts relate to

Art Unit: 2628

filling a form with different attributes. By incorporating the concept of the template #100 of Batres one may retrieve different data information by entering data values as “customer’s name”.

Regarding claim 3, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claim 1, above.

Regarding claim 2, Wolff teaches in fig. 5 step 314, the controller is configured to enable a user to define the content of the store.

Regarding claim 4, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claim 10, below.

Regarding claim 5, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claim 11, below.

Regarding claim 6, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claim 12, below.

Regarding claims 7-9, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claims 13-15, below.

Regarding claims 10 and 12, Wolff teaches in fig. 2 object 56, a corresponding further data entry field is an address entry field having a correct format for the address style data value. On the other hand, Wolff also discloses (in fig. 2 see object 56d-56g) a corresponding further data entry field is an address entry field having a correct format for the address style data value.

Regarding claim 11, the corresponding further data entry field corresponds in form with the data value entered into one data entry field. Fig. 2 object 56a shows different form styles with certain fields highlighted to indicate that they contain automatically suggested values.

Regarding claim 13, Wolff discloses (Fig. 2) wherein the controller further displays a corresponding plurality of further data entry field according to the stored attribute data

Art Unit: 2628

Regarding claim 14, Wolff discloses (Figs. 1 and 2) a corresponding plurality of further data entry fields correspond in form with the data value entered into the one data entry field.

Regarding claim 15, Wolff discloses (Figs. 6-7) a corresponding further data entry field indicating a style and the corresponding plurality of further data entry fields have correct formats for the indicated style.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAVID A. AMINI whose telephone number is (571)272-7654.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee Tung can be reached on 571-272-7794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2628

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Javid A Amini
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2628

/Javid A Amini/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2628